

ZFW



Docket No. US01-03060  
(FUJI.052)

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of Akihiro OKANO

Serial No.: 10/816,855

Group Art Unit: 2676

Filed: April 5, 2004

Examiner: Richer, Aaron M.

For: DISPLAY SCREEN BURN-IN PREVENTION DEVICE

Honorable Commissioner of Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW**

Sir:

Please review and enter the following remarks summarizing the interview conducted on June 7, 2006.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant's representative would like to thank Examiner Aaron M. Richer, Art Unit 2676, for courtesies extended in the personal interview conducted on June 7, 2006.

An Examiner's Interview Summary Record (PTOL-413) was mailed by the Examiner on June 9, 2006. Applicant submits this Statement to comply with the requirements of M.P.E.P. § 713.04.

In the interview, the following was discussed:

**A. Identification of claims discussed:**

Claims 1-20.

**B. Identification of prior art discussed:**

Weitbruch, et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0165064).

Crinon, et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0191846).

**C. Identification of principal proposed amendments:**

None.

**D. Brief Identification of principal arguments:**

Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed Weitbruch as applied to claim 1, including the traversal arguments set forth in the Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 filed on March 24, 2006.

The Examiner's interpretation of claim 1 also was clarified. Particularly, the Examiner clarified the interpretation that the blurring process of Weitbruch includes summing images to provide a blurred image.

The Examiner suggested clarifying the workings of the blurring device in the independent claims.

For example, the Examiner noted that Weitbruch discloses blurring the image by summing two or more images. On the other hand, Crinon discloses blurring by quantizing two images. The Examiner noted that the present invention appeared to be different from Weitbruch and Crinon in this respect.

**E. Results of the Interview:**

No agreement was reached. A final Office Action was mailed June 9, 2006.

**F. Conclusion:**

The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.


Serial No. 10/816,855  
Docket No. US01-03060  
(FUJI.052)

3

It is believed that no petition or fee is required. However, if the USPTO deems otherwise, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: July 7, 2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John J. Dresch, Esq.  
Registration No. 46,672

Sean M. McGinn  
Registration No. 34,386

**MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
LAW GROUP, PLLC**  
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200  
Vienna, Virginia 22182-3817  
(703) 761-4100  
**Customer No. 21254**